The Chairman called the meeting to order and stated it was being held in compliance with the “Open Public Meeting Act” and had been duly noticed and published as required by law.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Cupersmith, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Leonico, Mr. Willard, Mr. Senges

Absent: Mr. Brocco, Mr. Weil

Also, present, Mrs. CherylLynn Walters, Board Solicitor, Corrine Tarcelli, Zoning Board Secretary

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Willard motioned to approve the minutes from March 22, 2018; seconded by Mr. Cupersmith; none (0) against, with no (0) abstentions.

**RESOLUTION**

Mr. Cohen motioned to approve the Resolution for Case #ZC2018-003, Kingsway Learning Center, presented before the Board on March 22, 2018; seconded by Mr. Willard; none (0) against, with no (0) abstentions.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Timothy S. Watson**

1212 Cedar Avenue

Block 77, Lot 5.05

Case #ZC2018-006

Seeking a Variance relief from Section 150.13(A)(6) and 152.01(D)(1)(b) of the ULDO to permit the construction of a detached garage with a workshop and porch with a rear-yard setback of 5 feet where 15 feet is required and with a front-yard setback of 20 feet from the property line along Rail Road Avenue where 30 feet is required. Seeking any and all other variances, waivers and/or other relief as may be deemed necessary by the Board and/or its professionals.

Timothy Watson residing at 30 Millbridge Road, Laurel Springs, NJ 08021 was sworn in to testify. CherylLynn Waters stated the Board has a copy of the survey from Mr. Donovan dated June 11, 2008, last revised March 20, 2018. Mr. Watson stated due to the topography of the lot he is seeking variance approval in order to obtain usable recreational space.

Mr. Senges questioned what Mr. Watson was building and inquired as to whether or not it was a garage? Mr. Watson stated the single family home is the larger building that appears on the survey. Behind the home is a four hundred square foot detached garage. Mr. Senges stated there appears to be a two car garage on the survey for the new home they are planning to construct. Mr. Watson stated it’s a shed/workshop, however, Voorhees Township recommended he call it a detached garage. Mr. Senges questioned whether or not there will be a garage door. Mr. Watson stated there will be a garage door. Mr. Senges questioned whether or not Mr. Watson will be utilizing the building as a garage. Mr. Watson stated he was not using the building to store a vehicle but would be using it to store lawn equipment and tools. Mr. Senges inquired whether or not there was going to be access to it. He further stated since there will be no access to it that basically the structure is a large shed, however, someone with Zoning recommended he call it a garage. Mr. Watson stated, “Yes that is correct”.

Mr. Senges also mentioned he noticed several trees were removed. Mr. Watson stated there are four trees remaining and no trees were removed in the buffer zone. Mr. Senges questioned whether or not Mr. Watson received Township approval to remove the trees; in that trees of a certain caliber require approval to be removed if that are not within the building footprint. Mr. Watson stated he was not aware he needed permission to remove the trees. He also stated he is applying for the variance for the shed prior to building the home because he would like to have the home and the shed constructed at the same time.

Mr. Watson continued to state he would like to construct the new shed to store tools, lawn equipment, snow removal equipment, and to utilize the space as a workshop. Mrs. Walters stated the total footprint of the building is 397 square feet not including the 100 sq. ft. concrete pad for a total footprint of 497 square feet. She further stated anything larger than 100 sq. ft. requires a variance as an accessory building. If he is submitting an application for a shed, one of the conditions would be that it could never be utilized as a garage to store vehicles. Mr. Senges stated moving forward the Board has to refer to this structure as a shed.

Mrs. Walters stated the Board has to have legal justification to approve a structure of that size and there appears to be no inherent hardship other than having two frontages. Secondly, because the home isn’t constructed at this point in time, there is no hardship relative to space. The shed can be made smaller or it can be moved.

Mrs. Sharon Watson was sworn in to testify. She stated they would like to construct the shed to store lawn mowers, snow blowers, big men toys, Christmas decorations, etc. that need to be placed in a shed. She does not want these items in her garage. The garage will be used solely for their vehicles. Mr. Senges stated items can be stored in the basement. Mrs. Watson stated the basement will be finished and therefore she does not want Mr. Watson’s equipment in the basement.

Mr. Senges stated no one has ever come before the Board requesting a variance for a shed of this size. The Board typically approves sheds however, a shed of this size would never be approved. He then questioned whether or not the new owner of the property behind them was sent notice. It was confirmed that notice was sent to the new owner of the property located behind them. Mr. Senges questioned whether or not the shed could be moved. Mr. Watson stated it would overlap with the patio. Mr. Senges stated there appears to be a new patio on the survey located behind the back of the home and questioned why they need a 100 square foot patio on the shed. Mrs. Watson stated they would like to place patio furniture and a grill on the 100 square foot patio. Mr. Senges stated there is a 16 x 16 patio on the back of the home. Mr. Watson stated their long term goal is to convert that space into a three-season room.

Mr. Cohen questioned as to whether or not they will be running power/electricity to the shed. Mr. Watson stated they will be running power to the shed.

Mr. Senges stated Mr. and Mrs. Watson will have to make the shed smaller in that all of their arguments are not based on need and given the fact they have a two car garage and a full basement. He further stated the Watson’s have not presented any proofs as to why the Board should approve the structure. Mr. Watson stated 50% of his lot is unusable. Mr. Senges stated a smaller building would diminish the requirement for a variance for size, setback, etc.

Mr. Willard suggested the Watsons take some time to discuss what they would like to do. He also indicated they could request a continuance for the next meeting as opposed to having to make a decision this evening.

The meeting was opened to the public. Seeing no one, the public portion was closed.

Mr. and Mrs. Watson requested a continuance. Mrs. Walters informed them they could present their application to the Board at the next meeting scheduled to take place on May 10th and there would be no need to notice. She also stated if they needed more time, they could attend the meeting on May 10th and request another continuance in person or they could chose to make notice once again for a future hearing.

Mr. Cupersmith made a motion to approve the request for a continuance; seconded by Mr. Willard.

Ayes: Mr. Cohen, Mr. Daddario, Mr. Leonico, Mr. Senges

Nays: None

Seeing no further business Mr. Willard makes a motion to adjourn, seconded by Mr. Cohen.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Corrine Tarcelli

Zoning Board Secretary